

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated March 28, 2006, claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12, 14-17, and 19-24 are pending. Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12, 14-17, 19, and 22-24 are allowed. Claims 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Arguments in Response to 35 U.S.C. §112 Rejection

Pending claims 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Examiner states: "The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention." The specific limitation identified by Examiner is the tabs not required to be pivoted to a non-flexible position within the tire to hold front panel in the predetermined position.

Claim 20 is amended herein to delete the limitation "wherein said tabs are capable of being inserted into the tire and are not required to be pivoted to a non-flexible position within the tire to hold front panel in the predetermined position," and include the limitation "wherein said tabs are capable of being inserted into the tire to provide a biasing force to said tire to hold said front panel in a predetermined position." Support for this limitation is found in paragraph 40 of the Specification, which states: "the four tabs **30, 40, 50 and 60** provide a spring biasing force between the tire and the display insert to provide secure support. Tabs **30, 40, 50 and 60** are bent along scored edges **31, 41, 51 and 61**, respectively so that tabs **30, 40, 50 and 60** protrude outwardly away from the front panel section **20**."

Claim 20 complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as all claimed subject matter of the claim is described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 21 depends from claim 20 and includes additional limitation, all of which are supported by the specification. Therefore, claim 21 complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

In light of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 20 and 21 and respectfully requests indication that such claims are allowable. Therefore, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this case, the Examiner is encouraged to call undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: 10/30/06

Robert H. Earp, III Reg. No. 41,004
McDonald Hopkins Co., LPA
600 Superior Avenue, E.
Suite 2100
Cleveland, OH 44114-2653
(216) 348-5740